## **EXHIBIT A**

|    | 1  |
|----|--|
| 1  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |
| 2  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION               |
| 3  |  |
| 4  | ROSY GIRON DE REYES, ) et al, )  |
| 5  | ) Civil 16-563 Plaintiffs, )   |
| 6  | v. )   |
| 7  | ) Alexandria, Virginia WAPLES MOBILE HOME PARK ) November 8, 2019      |
| 8  | LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ) et al, )  |
| 9  | Defendants. )<br>)   |
| 10 |  |
| 11 | TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE T. S. ELLIS          |
| 12 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE   |
| 13 |  |
| 14 | APPEARANCES:   |
| 15 | For the Plaintiffs: Simon Yehuda Sandoval-Moshenberg Gianna Puccinelli |
| 16 | Gianna Fuccineiii  |
| 17 | For the Defendants: Michael Sterling Dingman<br>Grayson Hanes          |
| 18 | Grayson names  |
| 19 | Court Reporter: PATRICIA A. KANESHIRO-MILLER, RMR, CRR                 |
| 20 | Court Reporter. TAIRICIA A. RANDONINO MIDDEN, RAN, CRA                 |
| 21 | Proceedings reported by stenotype shorthand.                           |
| 22 | Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.                   |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
|    |  |

25

```
1
                THE COURT: I'm not sure I see how you and the
 2
        defendant are in disagreement.
 3
                MS. PUCCINELLI: Just that the Court was considering
        both the summary judgment ruling that this Court made and the
 4
 5
        motion to dismiss ruling --
                THE COURT: But they didn't rule on summary judgment.
 6
 7
        They didn't remand and say, okay, it's all over on disparate
 8
        impact.
 9
                MS. PUCCINELLI: Correct, Your Honor. But they
10
        needed to reinstate the Fair Housing Act claim.
11
                THE COURT: But only the disparate impact portion of
12
        it.
13
                MS. PUCCINELLI: Yes.
14
                THE COURT: All right. Go on.
15
                MS. PUCCINELLI: And contrary to what the defendants
16
        have represented, there are, in fact, two controlling
17
        decisions in this case, " Inclusive Communities, as well as
        the Fourth Circuit's decision. And the Fourth Circuit set
18
19
        forth the standards to apply at each stage of the disparate
2.0
        impact analysis. Under -- and this is at page 424. And the
21
        court said, "under the first step, the plaintiffs must
22
        demonstrate the robust causal connection between the
23
        defendant's challenged policy and the disparate impact of a
24
        protected class.
```

It goes on to state, "Under the second step, the